DECISION DELEGATED TO HEAD OF PLANNING

Application No:	**H16-0721-26**	**Applicant:**	**Mrs K Pakkiyatnathar**
Proposal:	Repainting of Shop Front, Signage & Associated Lighting - Retrospective		
Location:	25 New Road Spalding		
Terminal Date:	25th September 2026		

Planning Policies

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Adopted: March 2019

02	Development Management
03	Design of New Development
29	The Historic Environment

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework August 2026

Section 14 - Achieving well-designed places
Section 20 - Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

Representations:

	Object	Support	No Obj.	Comments
WARD MEMBER	0	0	0	0
OTHER STATUTORY BODIES	0	0	0	1
RESIDENTS	1	0	0	0

CASE OFFICER ASSESSMENT

Description of Proposal

This is a listed building consent application for the repainting of the existing shop front to black, and installation of signage and associated lighting. An accompanying advertisement consent application has also been submitted under H16-0723-26. This application is made retrospectively.

The details of the signage provided within the submitted Heritage, Design and Access Statement

appear to be inconsistent with the details provided in the Application Form associated with H16-0723-26. These discrepancies are highlighted where relevant.

Sign A (facing east) measures approximately 7315mm by 610mm. It is constructed of aluminium composite with raised letters constructed of Foamex (PVC). The southernmost first three metres are yellow and is lit by a trough light. The remaining length of the sign is spot lit, finished in black with white lettering.

It is stated within the Design and Access Statement that Sign B (facing south) measures 5893mm by 279mm; however, on the Application Form for H16-0723-26, the measurements are stated to be 0.6m by 0.9m. Again, this is constructed of aluminium composite, with applied Foamex lettering. The first 2m are lit via trough lighting, with the remaining being lit by three spotlights. The same design is present as Sign A, being a rooster (which is not shown on the submitted plans) with "wingz spot burgers chicken hot wings peri peri" written on the sign.

Two hanging signs have been installed. No details of these signs have been provided within the Design and Access Statement; however, the application form for H16-0723-26 lists provides measurements of 900mm (height) by 600mm (width), projecting 1000mm from the frontage. These adverts would also be externally illuminated through trough lighting. They have been installed in existing brackets.

In addition to the above, external stickers appear to have been applied to the windows. These are not referenced in the application. The shop front has been painted black.

Site Description

The site is within the town centre boundaries of Spalding, as outlined within the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, 2019. The site is within the Spalding Conservation Area. It is located on the corner of New Road and Pinchbeck Road. The ground floor is occupied by a hot food takeaway.

The site is listed, alongside the adjoining 24 New Road, given the following description by Historic England:
"Late C18. No 25 is of 2 storeys and attics in painted local brick. Welsh slate roof with 2 gabled dormers. 4 windows with stucco lintels with keystones, no glazing bars. C19 shop front with plain pilasters. Modern fenestration to Pinchbeck Street elevation. No 24 is of similar date and materials, but has modern fenestration and modern shop front."

Relevant History

H16-0723-26 - Advertisement - Signage with Associated Lighting - Retrospective - Ongoing

H16-0215-99 - LBC - Repaint shop window & letters of sign blue with stallriser & wall Honey Stone & sign background Wheatgerm - Approved 30/04/99

H16-0401-96 - LBC - Fume extraction unit and signs - Approved 31/07/96

H16-0544-95 - Full - Change of use to bistro/ restaurant - Approved 16/10/95

Consultation Responses

The responses received from consultees during the initial consultation exercises, which can be viewed in their entirety through the South Holland website, can be summarised as follows:

Conservation Officer

We are unable to support this application on built heritage grounds.
The Local Planning Authority has a statutory duty to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the listed building, its setting and any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses (16 and 66, Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990).
The proposed alterations would result in harm to the character and appearance of the building and its traditional shopfront. In particular, the proposed colour scheme and modern font/lettering are visually at odds with the historic character of the building and fail to respond positively to its appearance and significance.
Further harm would arise from the covering of the existing timber fascia with an aluminium fascia.

The timber fascia is a traditional feature that contributes positively to the character and appearance of the shopfront. Its concealment behind a modern aluminium finish would obscure this historic feature and introduce an unsympathetic material that detracts from the building's character and appearance.
The proposed lighting is also considered excessive in terms of its quantity and prominence. The additional fittings would have a visually intrusive effect, creating a more overtly commercial appearance that is at odds with the character of the building and its setting. A more restrained and discreet approach to illumination would be preferable.
Taken together, the proposed alterations fail to preserve or enhance the significance of the heritage asset. The works do not better reveal the building's architectural or historic interest and would instead result in harm to its character and appearance. Furthermore, the proposals would detract from the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, within which the building makes a positive contribution overall.
For these reasons, the proposal is not supported on heritage grounds.

Public Representations

This application has been advertised in accordance with the Development Procedure Order and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. In this instance, one letter of objection has been received.

This can be summarised as:

-Colour is inappropriate
-Lights are out of keeping
-Lighting is a distraction on the corner
-No separate access to living area

Key Planning Considerations

Evaluation

Section 16 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires the local planning authority to have special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings, their setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess.

The adopted South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036, adopted March 2019 (SELLP), is the development plan for the district, and is the basis for decision making in South Holland. The relevant development plan policies are detailed within the report above.

The policies and provisions set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, 2026 (NPPF) are also a material consideration in the determination of planning applications, alongside adopted Supplementary Planning Documents.

Layout, Design, Scale and Consideration of the Character of the Area and Heritage Considerations

Policy Context - Design

Section 14 of the NPPF, "Achieving well-designed places", outlines that planning decisions and policies should "promote high quality, healthy, inclusive and sustainable places".

Paragraph 1 of DP3 outlines that "development proposals should respond to their context (the history, character and features of their site and its setting), so that they integrate with and enhance their surroundings; such as through the arrangement of development plots and buildings, the use of materials and architectural features, and the restoration, reuse and integration of heritage assets".

In order to create well-designed places, Paragraph 2 states proposals should reflect seven key principles, as appropriate to the nature of the development and its location. These are: liveability, climate, nature, movement, built form, public space, and identity.

Paragraph 3 of DP3 is explicit that proposals which conflict with paragraph 1, the relevant aspects of paragraph 2 of DP3, or relevant development plan policies and guidance, should be refused. Conversely, substantial weight should be given to compliance with relevant development plan policies when assessing the design quality of proposals.

Likewise, Policy 2 of the SELLP outlines sustainable development considerations for proposals; providing a framework for an operational policy to be used in assessing the sustainable development attributes of all development proposals. Furthermore, Policy 3 of the SELLP requires development to comprise good design; identifying issues that should be considered when preparing schemes so that development sits comfortably with, and adds positively to, its historically designated or undesignated townscape or landscape surroundings.

These policies accord with the provisions of the NPPF and require that design which is inappropriate to the local area, or which fails to maximise opportunities for improving the character and quality of an area, will not be acceptable. Proposals for new development would therefore require the aforementioned considerations to be adequately assessed and designed, including the siting, design, and scale to be respectful of surrounding development and ensure that the character of the area is not compromised.

Policy Context - Listed Building

Section 16 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires the local planning authority to have special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings, their setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess.

Policy HE6(1) of the NPPF outlines that "when considering the potential effect of a development proposal on the significance of a designated heritage asset, substantial weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential effect amounts to a positive effect, harm, substantial harm, or total loss of its significance."

The above assessment of impact should be informed by the submission of an appropriate Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA). On this point, Policy HE5(1) of the NPPF outlines that " proposals affecting heritage assets should be accompanied by an assessment of the significance of the assets affected (including any contribution made by their setting) and of the potential effect of the proposal on their significance. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is necessary to understand the potential effect of the proposal on their significance." HE5(2) outlines that this assessment should identify whether the proposal would have a positive effect, no effect or harm to the asset, and the degree of harm caused.

The aforementioned harm can be divided into harm, substantial harm, or total loss. HE6(4) outlines that in such circumstances the harm must be weighed against any public benefits of the proposal, with the extent of benefits required to outweigh harm being determined, in part, by the extent of harm.

Policy 29 of the SELLP outlines that all proposals shall conserve and enhance the character and appearance of designated heritage assets. Section A of Policy 29 outlines criteria which applications relating to listed buildings should conform to. These are as follows:

"1. Proposals to change the use of a Listed Building or to alter or extend such a building will be granted where the Local Planning Authority is satisfied that the proposal is in the interest of the building's preservation and does not involve activities or alterations prejudicial to the special architectural or historic interest of the Listed Building or its setting.
2. Proposals involving the demolition of Listed Buildings will not be permitted, unless in an exceptional case, or wholly exceptional case (depending on their grade) where a clear and convincing justification is made in line with national policy.
3. Proposals that affect the setting of a Listed Building will be supported where they preserve or better reveal the significance of the Listed Building."

Policy Context - Design Guides and Conservation Area Appraisal

The Spalding Conservation Area was appraised within the 2026 Spalding Conservation Area Appraisal. This document outlines that the site is within the "historic commercial centre" of Spalding. Whilst commentary on the specific application site is limited, the following quotation is relevant: "In the north of the character area, the management of shop fronts to commercial buildings around the junction of New Road and Pinchbeck Road is an area of concern. These buildings appear to have signages erected which are in stark contrast to the muted colours of the historic buildings around them."

In addition to this, the Spalding Shopfront Design Guide acts as supplementary planning guidance relating to works to shop fronts in the settlement. It highlights best practice, and a series of design principles which should influence the design of shop fronts in the town.

Finally, the South & East Lincolnshire Traditional Buildings Design Guide is also relevant adopted guidance here. Again, this outlines broad principles and "action" points relating to the improvement of the historic environment in South Holland. This document outlines certain elements which would be inherently inappropriate in the setting of most listed buildings.

Assessment

As previously outlined, Policy HE5 of the NPPF is clear that proposals should be supported by an assessment of the significance of the heritage asset and the impact of a proposal on the asset. Whilst the Applicant has been provided a brief Heritage, Design and Access Statement, this document appears to be insufficient to meet the requirements of Policy HE5. The information provided is overly simplistic with no significant analysis of the impacts upon the significance of the asset, no scaled elevations have been provided, and no details of the hanging signs, the method of securing the signage, specific paint type specific detailing of the spotlights, or levels of illumination have been provided within this application. Moreover, elements such as the scale of Sign B which have been provided contradict the application made under reference H16-0723-26 for the exact same proposal.

The proposal therefore is considered to be at conflict with Policy HE5 of the NPPF due to the lack of information provided.

In any event, the proposal is considered to cause harm to the listed building. The previously plain pilasters, which are referenced within the Historic England listing, have been painted black. This would weaken the existing character of the building, and remove an important positive factor, whilst also increasing the perceived massing of the building by removing existing features which break the uniformity of the building. The use of an all black colour scheme, in the manner presented during the case officer's site visit, creates an overly bold feature which fails to respect the heritage asset.

Moreover, the loss of the timber signage and its replacement with aluminium would, as outlined by the Conservation Officer, would be detrimental to the traditional appearance of the shop front. The use of PVC further exacerbates this effect, due to its modernity. The proposed signage would therefore appear anachronistic and would sharply contrast the traditional appearance of the building. Furthermore, no details of the fixing of this signage have been provided, and so it cannot be concluded that these works would not have harmed the mortar or brick work.

The spotlights create an additional projecting feature, adding to the visual clutter of the unit. Due to the existing CCTV cameras on the building, the proposed spotlights would create visual clutter, detracting from the appearance of the unit. Moreover, their significant brightness would draw greater attention to these features, exacerbating the impact. In addition, the use of spot lights creates an unusual feature, in that only small, focussed cones of light are present, rather than the typical strip lighting one would expect for a fascia sign. Accordingly, this feature appears highly incongruous.

The lighting appears overly bright in this setting. Whilst not only harming the street scene as a result of this brightness, the lighting would also draw greater attention to the unit and highlight the incongruous features to a greater extent. Therefore, the feature would exacerbate the aforementioned harm.

Page 41 of the South & East Lincolnshire Traditional Buildings Design Guide outlines that modern plastic paints are often harmful to listed buildings, and should be avoided. The details of the paint have not been provided here. As such, it cannot be concluded that the works would not be harmful to listed building, and would not conflict with the guidance documents.

The Spalding Shopfront Guide states: "Small, individual shoplight units, positioned discreetly and concealed as much as possible, are preferred over spotlights or swan-neck lights". The proposed spot lights therefore directly contradicts this element of the design guide.

Moreover, the Spalding Shopfront Guide states: "Large vinyl or direct application stickers on shopfront windows (external or internal) are not appropriate within Lincolnshire's conservation areas. They can harm the special character and appearance of our historic town centres". The

application of stickers here, which were in situ at the time of the Officer's site visit, are therefore directly to the principles of the design guide.

The Spalding Conservation Area appraisal is explicit that bright and bold colours within the area of the junction of New Road and Pinchbeck Road are a point of concern, and that more muted colours would be preferable. The yellow of the signage is not muted, and is considered to contrast with the aforementioned statement in the Conservation Area Appraisal. Whilst this document explicitly relates to the Conservation Area, the principles of preserving the historic environment which underpin the document can still be applied to specific listed buildings.

The works are therefore considered to represent harm to the heritage asset. As previously stated, Policy HE6 of the NPPF states:
"Where a development proposal would harm the significance of a designated heritage asset the effect on the asset and its significance should be weighed against any public benefits resulting from the proposal. Important public benefits can include securing the long-term reuse of a vacant or underused listed building, and enabling energy efficiency and low carbon heating measures to be employed"

It is not considered that the benefits of the proposal would outweigh the harm identified. The alterations are not essential for the reuse of the building, as evidenced by the historic use of the building for a takeaway which contained more sensitive features. There are no over-riding or significant public benefits emerging from the lighting and signage.

In any event, regardless of the extent of harm identified, Policy 29 is clear that all proposals should preserve or enhance listed buildings. The loss of traditional features and the installation of anachronistic and poorly designed elements would fail to preserve the assets, and would be contrary to Policy 29 as a result.

For these reasons, the proposal is considered contrary to Policies 2, 3 and 29 of the SELLP and Section 14 and 20 of the NPPF.

Planning Balance

Section 16 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires the local planning authority to have special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings, their setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess.

The proposal is considered to represent harm to a Grade II listed building. This harm is not outweighed by the benefits of the proposal, which themselves are considered to be negligible.

Additional Considerations

Public Sector Equality Duty

In making this decision the Authority must have regard to the public sector equality duty (PSED) under s.149 of the Equalities Act. This means that the Council must have due regard to the need (in discharging its functions) to:
A. Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act
B. Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not. This may include removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic; taking steps to meet the special needs of those with a protected characteristic; encouraging participation in public life (or other areas where they are underrepresented) of people with a protected characteristic(s).
C. Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not including tackling prejudice and promoting understanding.

The protected characteristics are age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.

The PSED must be considered as a relevant factor in making this decision but does not impose a duty to achieve the outcomes in s.149. It is only one factor that needs to be considered, and may be balanced against other relevant factors.

It is not considered that the recommendation in this case will have a disproportionately adverse impact on a protected characteristic.

Human Rights

In making a decision, the Authority should be aware of and take into account any implications that may arise from the Human Rights Act 1998. Under the Act, it is unlawful for a public authority such as South Holland District Council to act in a manner that is incompatible with the European Convention on Human Rights. The Authority is referred specifically to Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life) and Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property).

It is not considered that the recommendation in this case interferes with local residents' right to respect for their private and family life, home and correspondence, except insofar as it is necessary to protect the rights and freedoms of others (in this case, the rights of the applicant). The Council is also permitted to control the use of property in accordance with the general public interest and the recommendation is considered to be a proportionate response to the submitted application based on the considerations set out in this report.

Conclusion

Taking these factors into consideration, the proposal is considered contrary to Policies 2, 3, and 29 of the SELLP, as well as Sections 14 and 20 of the NPPF. There are no significant factors in this case that would outweigh the harm identified; therefore, the planning balance is against the proposal.

Recommendation

Based on the assessment detailed above, it is recommended that the proposal should be refused under Delegated Authority.